The Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., 156 Fifth Ave.

OFFICE OF RECORDING SECRETARY.

COPY OF ACTION OF BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.
AT A MEETING HELD IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK, February 7th 1888

"It was Resolved That henceforth, after the application of any Candidate for appointment as a missionary has been presented to the Board, and his or her testimonials examined by the Secretaries, the unanimous judgment of the Secretaries relative to the appointment of such persons, be accepted by the Board, with the understanding that the Office be ready in each case to present a resumé of the testimonials if desired by the Board, and that any of the papers be read in full if called for."

Medical

Action January 24th 1887

"Applications for appointment as Medical Missionaries were presented from Dr. J. D King and Miss Mary E Bradford, M.D. These applications were laid over according to the rules of the Board"

Case of Russell

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK.
A.B.C. CODE, 4TH EDITION.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY.

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.
156 FIFTH AVENUE.

New York, March 21st., *189* 9

To the

Presbytery of St. Lawrence.

Dear Brethren:

Mr. James Elmer Russell, whom we understand to be a licentiate under your care, has applied for appointment as a foreign missionary, and we understand will shortly seek ordination at your hands. His application and testimonials give us a high opinion of his intellectual and spiritual qualifications. He has made a delightful personal impression upon us all.

A question regarding his theological and ecclesiastical qualifications, however, has been raised by the following statement from the Rev. Henry M. Booth, D. D., LL. D., President of Auburn Theological Seminary, where Mr. Russell spent his Junior and Middle years: -

"A young man of true Christian character and of earnest consecration. Has a keenly speculative mind. Did not take c ordially to the syst m of doctrine taught here. He may be a champion of the Presbyterian Standards, and he may not. I should recommend that he be given an opportunity to express himself freely on theological subjects before he goes too far in his hope of being sent out by our Board."

This opinion of Dr. Booth's was referred to a Special Committee by the Board, which t the meeting held March 20th. presented the following report which was unanimously adopted: -

"The Committee appointed to confer with Mr. J. Elmer Russell beg leave to report that inasmuch as no appointment of a clerical missionary is complete till he is ordained, and as the President of the Seminary in which Mr. Russell obtained the major part of his theolog-

ical education has expressed doubt concerning his perfect accord with the doctrinal system of the Presbyterian Church, it is recommended that the Board, having no authority to pass upon ecclesiastical questions, refer the communication of President Booth to the Presbytery with which Mr. Russell is connected that it may exercise due dilligence in ascertaining his soundness in the faith.

JOHN D. WELLS
HOWARD DUFFIELD.
GEORGE ALEXANDER."

Awaiting your judgment and praying that the blessing of God may rest upon you, I remain, in behalf of the Board of Foreign Missions

Secretary.

O. K.

C. CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK.
A.B.C. CODE, 4TH EDITION.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY.

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.
156 FIFTH AVENUE.

POST OFFICE BOX F,
STATION O.

Copy New York, March 6, 1899. 189

Rev. Charles Cuthbert Hall, D. D.,
700 Park Avenue,
New York City.

My dear Dr. Hall:

We heartily thank you for your letter of the 2nd inst., regarding Mr. Russell, ~~a candidate for appointment as a foreign missionary.~~ The discussion regarding him, to which you refer, arose from his own voluntary statements ~~to us,~~ as well as from letters sent to us at his request by his former professors in Auburn Seminary. ~~While our jurisdiction in theological and ecclesiastical matters is limited, so that the Presbytery concerned must pass upon the main question, I have pleasure in writing that~~ We heartily agree with you and with your colleagues ~~in the faculty of Union Seminary~~ in entertaining a high opinion of Mr. Russell's intellectual and spiritual qualifications. He has made a delightful personal impression upon us all. ~~Whether~~ However his views ~~are sufficiently in accord with Presbyterianism to justify his admission to the ministry of our Church is, of course, a question upon which we have no authority to pass, his Presbytery alone being competent to decide that question in connection with his ordination. If the Presbytery ordains him, we shall have great pleasure in issuing his commission as a foreign missionary.~~ The questions which he himself has raised belong to his Presbytery. As the applications of candidates are ordinarily made to the Board in the winter or early spring and as their

examinations for ordination cannot usually be held until the stated meetings of Presbytery in April, it is our rule to use the following formula in passing upon all approved applications, no matter who the man may be or where he comes from.

" The Board approved the application and testimonials of Mr.-- but in accordance with the habitual practice of the Board as expressed in Paragraph 22 of the Manual and in the Board's special action of December 18th, 1893, this appointment shall not be considered complete and the commission shall not be issued until the Board receives the recommendation of the Presbytery to which he belongs, as to his theological qualifications and ecclesiastical standing at the time of his ordination. The Secretary in charge shall in each case inform the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery that the Board will await its action". ~~It was also voted that in respect to applications for appointment of medical and other laymen or lady missionaries married or unmarried, the Board shall in accordance with its forms of application satisfy itself of their doctrinal soundness, and their freedom from any beliefs or usages which might impair the harmony of mission circles".~~

Cordially yours,

(copy of letter sent by Dr. Halsey with attached certificate)

(5)

April 21st, 1902.

The following Minutes relating to the Appointments of Ministerial Candidates was adopted.

"No Ministerial Candidate shall be accepted by the Board, until he has been licensed by the Presbytery to which he belongs, unless in extraordinary cases, for reasons which shall be submitted to the Board for their action."

Adopted by the Board May 6th, 1902.

At the last meeting of the Board April 21st, 1902, a rule was proposed to govern the consideration by the Board of applications for appointment from ministerial candidates. The matter was referred to the Council with instructions to consider the whole question and report to the Board. The language of the proposed rule was as follows:

"No ministerial candidate shall be accepted by the Board until he has been licensed by the Presbytery to which he belongs, unless in extraordinary cases, for reasons which shall be submitted to the Board for their action."

In order to get all possible light on this question, especially with reference to the effect of such a rule on students in the theological seminaries, who are obliged to make plans in advance, the Council asked Dr. Wm. M. Paxton and Dr. Stevenson for their opinions, and received the following replies:

Dr. Paxton wrote April 26th, 1902:

"Your letter has been received. Allow me to state this matter as it lies in my own mind.

The General Assembly has committed the choice of ministers for the missionary field into the hands of the Presbytery and our Board of Foreign Missions. It assigns to each body its own special work. The Board of Missions is, first, to investigate the piety; second, the health; third, the aptitude of the applicant.

The Presbytery is charged with the work of investigating, first, the piety (this being so important it is given to both bodies); second, the scholarly attainments; and thirdly, the orthodoxy of the applicant.

Each of these bodies has its own work, and the order in which it is to be done has been settled by custom. First the student indicates to the Board of Foreign Missions his desire to be appointed as a missionary ; the Board should then perform its work of examining into his health, his pietyand his aptitude. This done, they should report to the Presbytery the name of the student, the result of their investigations and their recommendation to the Presbytery to proceed with its work in examining and endorsing the student. If this is satisfactory, they should report to the the Board that they are satisfied and that the way is clear to proceed with the applicant's appointment. This completes all the preparations, and the ordination can be completed at some future time.

This will make the steps perfectly clear, and prevent any complication between the Board and the Presbytery. It will at the same time, free the applicant from any anxieties of mind, which I have known sometimes to affect the health of the student seriously.

I have often felt anxious about our students who had given in their names as candidates, and become very much discouraged by the long delay between the action of the Board and the Presbyter

This plan also will readily discover any theological deficiency or error in the student; and it will only make anxious the minds of those who are conscious of false opinions, whilst orthodox men will have no anxiety whatever about their acceptance.

It seems to me that if this plan, as originally intended, is carried out, there need be no conflict whatever between the Board and the Presbytery."

Dr. J. Ross Stevenson wrote April 25th, 1902:-

"Yours of the 22nd inst. has been received, and in reply I beg to state that I hope the rule of the Board respecting candidates will not be changed so that students in the Seminary shall have to wait until the close of the senior year before they can know definitely whether they are to go to the foreign field. The situation in McCormick may be peculiar, but the siege from the home fields begins early there very early in the senior year, and most of the students have accepted calls before the time of graduation arrives. Under the old rule, I heard a great many complaints that applicants were kept waiting so long; and when the change was made so that candidates could apply in the fall, and be approved subject to the action of Presbytery, it was a great relief to our students. I would be very sorry to see this changed.

On the other hand, I can see how hazardous it is to appoint young men who have not been licensed; and I know instances where Presbyteries have declared that they would not have licensed certain men had they not been already appointed by the Foreign Board.

The difficulty might be met by requiring those who expect to go to the foreign field to receive licenses from their Presbytery at the close of the middle year. Most of the students can prepare for license at this time, and if they knew that this was a condition requisite to a Board appointment, I think it would be complied with in almost every case, and might be possible for the Board to make exceptions when proper assurances have been given. I suppose that if some such plan were adopted, the Board would still make the appointment conditional on Presbyterial ordination."

Having carefully considered the whole question, the Council would report, recommending-

1. That in accordance with the historic position of the Board, as described in Dr. Paxton's letter, the Board recognizes that the responsibilityfor considering the doctrinal views of ministerial candidates rests with the Presbyteries, this position having been affirmed by the Board in the case of the Rev. E. B. McGilvary, on Dec. 18, 1893, in the following action;

"The Board has but one rule in reference to cases involving doctrinal or ecclesiastical questions, namely; to refer them to the Presbytery to which the missionary concerned belongs. In the only similar case which occurred in the last twenty years, the question of the doctrinal views of the missionary concerned was simply re-

ferred to his Presbytery. This rule should exempt the Board from all difficulties and discussions in such matters. It regards its functions as that of an Executive Body charged with the propagation of the Gospel under the direction of the General Assembly, its missionaries being subject to their Presbyteries in all doctrinal or ecclesiastical matters."

In the case of Mr. J. E. Russell, on March 20th, 1899, in the following action was taken on the recommendation of a Special Committee consisting of Drs. Wells, Duffield and Alexander-

"The Committee appointed to confer with Mr. J. Elmer Russell, beg leave to report, that inasmuch as no appointment of a Clerical Missionary is complete till he is ordained, and as the President of the Seminary in which Mr. Russell obtained the major part of his theological education has expressed doubt concerning his perfect accord with the doctrinal system of the Presbyterian Church, it is recommended that the Board, having no authority to pass upon ecclesiastical questions, refer the communication of President Booth to the Presbytery with which Mr. Russell is connected, that it may exercise due diligence in ascertaining his soundness in the faith."

2. That in view of the desirability of the Presbyteries acting upon the cases of candidates for licensure under no constraint that might arise from prior actions of the Board upon such questions as to the candidates' fitness as come before it, and in view of the desirability of the Board having before it at the time of its consideration of applications a report from each candidate's Presbytery as to his Presbyterial standing, the faculties and students of the theological seminaries be informed that the Board desires to have all prospective candidates for appointment as foreign missionaries appear before their Presbyteries for licensure, at the end of their middle year.

3. That in the case of seniors in theological seminaries who have not been licensed by their Presbyteries, or who have not been able to decide whether to offer themselves for missionary appointment until their senior year, the Board will entertain their applications and pass upon them as to the health, aptitude, piety and general education of the applicant, referring the remaining questions to the Presbytery, as proposed in Dr. Paxton's letter.

4. In such cases, a letter should be sent to the Presbytery concerned, clearly stating the situation, describing the joint responsibility shared by the Presbytery and Board, and guarding against any tendency on the part of the Presbytery to deal lightly with its responsibilities, in view of the Board's prior consideration.

Adopted by the Board May 6th, 1902.

At the last meeting of the Board April 21st, 1902, a rule was proposed to govern the consideration by the Board of applications for appointment from ministerial candidates. The matter was referred to the Council with instructions to consider the whole question and report to the Board. The language of the proposed rule was as follows:

"No ministerial candidate shall be accepted by the Board until he has been licensed by the Presbytery to which he belongs, unless in extraordinary cases, for reasons which shall be submitted to the Board for their action."

In order to get all possible light on this question, especially with reference to the effect of such a rule on students in the theological seminaries, who are obliged to make plans in advance, the Council asked Dr. Wm. M. Paxton and Dr. Stevenson for their opinions, and received the following replies:

Dr. Paxton wrote April 26th, 1902:

"Your letter has been received. Allow me to state this matter as it lies in my own mind.

The General Assembly has committed the choice of ministers for the missionary field into the hands of the Presbytery and our Board of Foreign Missions. It assigns to each body its own special work. The Board of Missions is, first, to investigate the piety; second, the health; third, the aptitude of the applicant.

The Presbytery is charged with the work of investigating, first, the piety (this being so important it is given to both bodies); second, the scholarly attainments; and thirdly, the orthodoxy of the applicant.

Each of these bodies has its own work, and the order in which it is to be done has been settled by custom. First the student indicates to the Board of Foreign Missions his desire to be appointed as a missionary ; the Board should then perform its work of examining into his health, his pietyand his aptitude. This done, they should report to the Presbytery the name of the student, the result of their investigations and their recommendation to the Presbytery to proceed with its work in examining and endorsing the student. If this is satisfactory, they should report to the the Board that they are satisfied and that the way is clear to proceed with the applicant's appointment. This completes all the preparations, and the ordination can be completed at some future time.

This will make the steps perfectly clear, and prevent any complication between the Board and the Presbytery. It will at the same time, free the applicant from any anxieties of mind, which I have known sometimes to effect the health of the student seriously.

I have often felt anxious about our students who had given in their names as candidates, and become very much discouraged by the long delay between the action of the Board and the Presbytery.

This plan also will readily discover any theological deficiency or error in the student; and it will only make anxious the minds of those who are conscious of false opinions, whilst orthodox men will have no anxiety whatever about their acceptance.

It seems to me that if this plan, as originally intended, is carried out, there need be no conflict whatever between the Board and the Presbytery."

Dr. J. Ross Stevenson wrote April 25th, 1908:-

"Yours of the 22nd inst. has been received, and in reply I beg to state that I hope the rule of the Board respecting candidates will not be changed so that students in the Seminary shall have to wait until the close of the senior year before they can know definitely whether they are to go to the foreign field. The situation in McCormick may be peculiar, but the siege from the home fields begins early there very early in the senior year, and most of the students have accepted calls before the time of graduation arrives. Under the old rule, I heard a great many complaints that applicants were kept waiting so long; and when the change was made so that candidates could apply in the fall, and be approved subject to the action of Presbytery, it was a great relief to our students. I would be very sorry to see this changed.

On the other hand, I can see how hazardous it is to appoint young men who have not been licensed; and I know instances where Presbyteries have declared that they would not have licensed certain young men had they not been already appointed by the Foreign Board.

The difficulty might be met by requiring those who expect to go to the foreign field to receive licenses from their Presbytery at the close of the middle year. Most of the students can prepare for license at this time, and if they knew that this was a condition requisite to a Board appointment, I think it would be complied with in almost every case, and might be possible for the Board to make exceptions when proper assurances have been given. I suppose that if some such plan were adopted, the Board would still make the appointment conditional on Presbyterial ordination."

Having carefully considered the whole question, the Council would report, recommending-

1. That in accordance with the historic position of the Board, as described in Dr. Paxton's letter, the Board recognizes that the responsibilityfor considering the doctrinal views of ministerial candidates rests with the Presbyteries, this position having been affirmed by the Board in the case of the Rev. E. B. McGilvary, on Dec. 18, 1893, in the following action;

"The Board has but one rule in reference to cases involving doctrinal or ecclesiastical questions, namely; to refer them to the Presbytery to which the missionary concerned belongs. In the only similar case which occurred in the last twenty years, the question of the doctrinal views of the missionary concerned was simply re-

ferred to his Presbytery. This rule should exempt the Board from all difficulties and discussions in such matters. It regards its functions as that of an Executive Body charged with the propagation of the Gospel under the direction of the General Assembly, its missionaries being subject to their Presbyteries in all doctrinal or ecclesiastical matters."

In the case of Mr. J. E. Russell, on March 20th, 1899, in the following action was taken on the recommendation of a Special Committee consisting of Drs. Wells, Duffield and Alexander-

"The Committee appointed to confer with Mr. J. Elmer Russell, beg leave to report, that inasmuch as no appointment of a Clerical Missionary is complete till he is ordained, and as the President of the Seminary in which Mr. Russell obtained the major part of his theological education has expressed doubt concerning his perfect accord with the doctrinal system of the Presbyterian Church, it is recommended that the Board, having no authority to pass upon ecclesiastical questions, refer the communication of President Booth to the Presbytery with which Mr. Russell is connected, that it may exercise due diligence in ascertaining his soundness in the faith."

2. That in view of the desirability of the Presbyteries acting upon the cases of candidates for licensure under no constraint that might arise from prior actions of the Board upon such questions as to the candidates' fitness as come before it, and in view of the desirability of the Board having before it at the time of its consideration of applications a report from each candidate's Presbytery as to his Presbyterial standing, the faculties and students of the theological seminaries be informed that the Board desires to have all prospective candidates for appointment as foreign missionaries appear before their Presbyteries for licensure, at the end of their middle year.

3. That in the case of seniors in theological seminaries who have not been licensed by their Presbyteries, or who have not been able to decide whether to offer themselves for missionary appointment until their senior year, the Board will entertain their applications and pass upon them as to the health, aptitude, piety and general education of the applicant, referring the remaining questions to the Presbytery, as proposed in Dr. Paxton's letter.

4. In such cases, a letter should be sent to the Presbytery concerned, clearly stating the situation, describing the joint responsibility shared by the Presbytery and Board, and guarding against any tendency on the part of the Presbytery to deal lightly with its responsibilities, in view of the Board's prior consideration.

Copy.

Adopted by the Board May 6th, 1902.

At the last meeting of the Board April 21st, 1902, a rule was proposed to govern the consideration by the Board of applications for appointment from ministerial candidates. The matter was referred to the Council with instructions to consider the whole question and report to the Board. The language of the proposed rule was as follows:

"No ministerial candidate shall be accepted by the Board until he has been licensed by the Presbytery to which he belongs, unless in extraordinary cases, for reasons which shall be submitted to the Board for their action."

In order to get all possible light on this ~~subject~~ question, especially with reference to the effect of such a rule on students in the theological seminaries, who are obliged to make plans in advance, the Council asked Dr. Wm. M. Paxton and Dr. Stevenson for their opinions, and received the following replies:

Dr. Paxton wrote April 26th, 1902:

"Your letter has been received. Allow me to state this matter as it lies in my own mind.

The General Assembly has committed the choice of ministers for the missionary field into the hands of the Presbytery and our Board of Foreign Missions. It assigns to each body its own special work. The Board of Missions is, first, to investigate the piety; second, the health; third, the aptitude of the applicant./

The Presbytery is charged with the work of investigating, first, the piety (this being so important it is given to both ~~sides~~ bodies); second, the scholarly attainments; and thirdly, the orthodoxy of the applicant.

Each of those bodies has its own work, and the order in which it is to be done has been settled by custom. First the student indicates to the Board of Foreign Missions his desire to be appointed as a missionary; the Board should then perform its work of examining into his health, his piety and his aptitude. This done, they should report to the Presbytery the name of the student, the result of their investigations and their recommendation to the Presbytery to proceed with its work in examining and endorsing the student. If this is satisfactory, they should report to the Board that they are satisfied and that the way is clear to proceed with the applicant's appointment. This completes all the preparations, and the ordination can be completed at some future time.

This will make the steps perfectly clear, and prevent any complication between the Board and the Presbytery. It will at the same time, free the applicant from any anxieties of mind, which I have known sometimes to affect the health of the student seriously.

I have often felt anxious about our students who had given ~~a~~ in their names as candidates, and become very much discouraged by the long delay between the action of the Board and the presbytery,

This plan also will readily discover any theological deficiency or error in the student; and it will only make anxious the minds of those who are conscious of false opinions, whilst orthodox men will have no anxiety whatever about their acceptance.

It seems to me that if this plan, as originally intended, is carried out, there need be no conflict whatever between the Board and the Presbytery."

Dr. J. Ross Stevenson wrote April 25th, 1902:-

"Yours of the 22nd inst. has been received, and in reply I beg to state that I hope the rule of the Board respecting candidates will not be changed so that students in the Seminary shall have to wait until the close of the senior year before they can know definitely whether they are to go to the foreign field. The situation in McCormick may be peculiar, but the siege from the home field begins early there very early in the senior year, and most of the students have accepted calls before the time of graduation arrives. Under the old rule, I heard a great many complaints that applicants were kept waiting so long; and when the change was made so that candidates could apply in the fall, and be approved subject to the action of Presbytery, it was a great relief to our students. I would be very sorry to see this changed.

On the other hand, I can see how hazardous it is to appoint young men who have not been licensed; and I know instances where Presbyteries have declared that they would not have licensed certain men had they not been already appointed by the Foreign Board.

The difficulty might be met by requiring those who expect to go to the foreign field to receive licenses from their Presbytery at the close of the middle year. Most of the students can prepare for license at this time, and if they knew that this was a condition requisite to a Board appointment, I think it would be complied with in almost every case, and it might be possible for the Board to make exceptions when proper assurances have been given. I suppose that if some such plan were adopted, the Board would still make the appointment conditional on Presbyterial ordination."

Having carefully considered the whole question, the Council would report, recommending -

1. That in accordance with the historic position of the Board, as described in Dr. Paxton's letter, the Board recognizes that the responsibility for considering the doctrinal views of ministerial candidates rests with the Presbyteries, this position having been affirmed by the Board in the case of the Rev. E. B. McGilvary, on Dec. 18, 1893, in the following action:

"The Board has but one rule in reference to cases involving doctrinal or ecclesiastical questions, namely; to refer them to the Presbytery to which the missionary concerned belongs. In the only similar case which occurred in the last twenty years, the question of the doctrinal views of the missionary concerned was simply referred to his Presbytery. This rule should exempt the Board from all difficulties and dis-

cussions in such matters. It regards its functions as that of an Executive Body charged with the propagation of the Gospel under the direction of the General Assembly, its missionaries being subject to their Presbyteries in all doctrinal or ecclesiastical matters."

In the case of Mr. J. E. Russell, on March 20th,1899, in the following action was taken on the recommendation of a Special Committee consisting of Drs. Wells, Duffield and Alexander -

"The Committee appointed to confer with Mr. J. Elmer Russell, beg leave to report, that inasmuch as no appointment of a Clerical Missionary is complete till he is ordained, and as the President of the Seminary in which Mr. Russell obtained the major part of his theological education has expressed doubt concerning his perfect accord with the doctrinal system of the Presbyterian Church, it is recommended that the Board, having no authority to pass upon ecclesiastical questions, refer the communication of President Booth to the Presbytery with which Mr. Russell is connected, that it may exercise due diligence in ascertaining his soundness in the faith."

2. That in view of the desirability of the Presbyteries acting upon the cases of candidates for licensure under no constraint that might arise from prior actions of the Board upon such questions as to the candidates' fitness as come before it, and in view of the desirability of the Board having before it at the time of its consideration of applications a report from each candidate's Presbytery as to his Presbyterial standing, the faculties and students of the theological seminaries be informed that the Board desires to have all prospective candidates for appointment as foreign missionaries appear before their Presbyteries for licensure, at the end of their middle year.

3. That in the case of seniors in theological seminaries who have not been licensed by their Presbyteries, or who have not been able to decide whether to offer themselves for missionary appointment until their senior year, the Board will entertain their applications and pass upon them as to the health, aptitude, piety and general education of the applicant, referring the remaining questions to the Presbytery, as proposed in Dr. Paxton's letter.

4. In such cases, a letter should be sent to the Presbytery concerned, clearly stating the situation, describing the joint responsi-

bility shared by the Presbytery and ~~the~~ Board, and guarding against any tendency on the part of the Presbytery to deal lightly with its responsibilities, in view of the Board's prior consideration.

CABLE ADDRESS:
"INCULCATE," NEW YORK
FOREIGN MISSIONS CODE
A. B. C. CODE, 4TH EDITION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.
156 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK

MADISON SQUARE BRANCH
P. O. BOX NO. 2.

Copy.

December 6th., 1904.

To the Presbytery of Brooklyn,

The Rev. Frederick Campbell, D.D., Stated Clerk,

428-1/2 Clinton Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Dear Brethren:

At the meeting of the Board of Foreign Missions the 5th instant, I presented your action of November 28th as communicated in the letter of the Rev. Frederick Campbell, D.D., Stated Clerk, dated Dec. 1st. The Board took the following action.-

"On the basis of a communication, dated De ember 1st, from the Rev. Fredeirck S. Campbell, D.D., Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of Brooklym, the Rev. F. E. Field and the Rev. William Cleysteen were authorized to sail at once for their respective missions, and in view of their detention in this country for about three months beyond the time at which they had planned to sail, it was voted to appropriate to each the sum of $100. for home allowance."

Sincerely yours,

Secretary.

Minutes of January 16, 1905 (d)

The Report of the Committee on Policy and Methods presented to the Board, January 3d, was taken up for consideration. Dr Fox moved to amend the third paragraph by inserting after the word "appointee" the words "either as to doctrinal soundness or moral and spiritual character" This amendment was lost, and the Report of the Committee was amended and adopted, as follows —

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON POLICY AND METHODS.

Presented January 3, 1905. adopted Jan. 16, 1905

The Committee on Policy and Methods recommend the adoption of the following Minute:

Referring to an action of the Board, May 6, 1902, defining its powers in the matter of determining the qualifications of Ministerial Candidates for appointment as Missionaries, the Board reaffirms its adherence to the principle therein set forth, namely, that it has no ecclesiastical functions and that all questions relating to ministerial standing or soundness in the faith must be authoritatively and finally settled by the Church Courts.

Accordingly in any case where evidence is brought before the Board tending to show doctrinal unsoundness on the part of a Ministerial appointee or candidate, it shall be promptly referred for investigation to the Presbytery to which he is responsible.

~~and~~ The Board, however, ~~in~~ while affirming the principle of the exclusive jurisdiction of ~~Presbytery~~ the courts of the Church in matters of orthodoxy, does not consider itself precluded thereby from reconsidering at any time ~~the general fit-~~ any phase of the fitness of an appointee for the arduous and responsible service of the Foreign Missionary and of assuring itself by proper and reasonable inquiries of his probable usefulness in the field.

The Board directs that this action shall be specially reported to the next General Assembly for approval, modification, or reversal.

In order to prevent embarrassing complications and possible disappointments, it is further Resolved that in the case of a candidate who has not received his training in the Presbyterian Church or whose educational advantages have not been such as to ensure an intelligent acquaintance with the standards of the Church, action upon his application shall ordinarily be deferred until the candidate has been examined and licensed by Presbytery.

* ~~and absolutely refusing to take any action affecting ecclesiastical~~ slander

Board adopted, Jan 16, 1905 6v

(withdrew name Jan 16)

Reply to the Protest of the ~~Rev. Dr. Robert Russell Booth~~, the Rev. Dr. John Fox and Mr. Warner Van Norden, dated December 19th, to the Board's action of December 5th in the case of the Revs. Frank E. Field and William H. Gleysteen.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

~~Your~~ Committee, ~~to whom was referred~~ the protest against the sending out of Messrs. Field and Gleysteen recommend the following answer:

With regard to the concluding sentence of this protest, and in justice to our Secretaries, the Board would state that no time was specified as to when the Council should write; that Dr. Brown , to whom the correspondence with these candidates naturally fell, was absent at the Synods on October 17th when the action was taken and that before his return, October 31st, Mr. Speer had to leave to visit the Synods, while Mr. Hard was also absent, ~~Dr. Ellinwood was ill.~~ Because of these absences no Council meeting was practicable till Nov. 3rd, by which time the receipt of another action of the Presbytery of Brooklyn had made it appear desirable to consult the Board again before starting the correspondence, the next meeting of the Board being only four days later. This delay was approved by the President and several members of the Board who happened to call at the office.

At this Board meeting on the 7th of November, the matter was referred back to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, and on motion of Dr. Booth, ~~one of the protestants~~, the Secretaries were directed to refrain from correspondence with the candidates till further orders.

As to the main points of the protest, the Board heartily agrees with the protestants as to the urgent importance of sending to the field only men sound in the faith as held by our Church. Our differ-

ence with them concerns the best method of securing such soundness. The Board has confidence in the method provided by the Constitution of our Church. It has been our well established policy, definitely formulated on the 6th of May, 1902, under the counsel of the late Dr. Wm. M. Paxton, that the Board should "recognize that the responsibility for considering the doctrinal views of ministerial candidates rests with the presbyteries", the Board accepting such candidates only on condition of their recommendation by the Presbyteries to which they severally belong.

In case of anxiety whether there might not be points of doctrinal unsoundness which had not been brought to the attention of the commending presbytery, the Board has conceiyed that it would be guilty of no disrespect to that body if it should refer the case to it for further assurance. This was done in the case of Mr. J. E. Russell, on March 20th, 1899, in the following action, taken on the recommendation of a Special Committee consisting of the Rev. Drs. John D. Wells, Howard Duffield and George Alexander-

"The Committee appointed to confer with Mr. J. Elmer Russell, beg leave to report, that inasmuch as no appointment of a clerical missionary is complete till he is ordained, and as the President of the Seminary in which Mr. Russell obtained the major part of his theological education has expressed doubt concerning his perfect accord with the doctrinal system of the Presbyterian Church, it is recommended that the Board, having no authority to pass upon ecclesiastical questions, refer the communication of President Booth to the Presbytery with which Mr. Russell is connected, that it may exercise due diligence in ascertaining his soundness in the faith."

This same course has been carefully pursued in the case now under discussion, as will appear from the following records,

ACTION TAKEN BY THE BOARD, November 7th, 1904.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

"The Board having under consideration the case of Messrs. Gleysteen and Field, and having heard certain statements made by members of the Board in which doubt in regard to the doctrinal soundness of these brethren was expressed, it was resolved that the case be referred to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, with the request that the Pres-

bytery take measures to ascertain the facts and to satisfy the Board in respect to this important question, and that meanwhile the Council be directed to refrain from further action under the Resolution of October 17th."

The reply of the Presbytery of Brooklyn was as follows:

"I respectfully report that , at its stated meeting held on Monday, Nov. 28th, the Presbytery adopted the following resolution,- "Presbytery commends the zeal of the Foreign Board that only men sound in the faith be sent to the foreign field, and its recognition that the determination of that soundness is the concern of the Presbyteries rather than of the Board itself. It gladly makes reply to the Board's inquiry that during the examination for ordination of the Rev. Mr. Field and the Rev. Mr. Gleysteen special attention was paid to their belief in the important doctrine of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and that they approved themselves to the Presbytery as brethren sound in their faith, and they were accordingly ordained."

Yours truly,
(signed) Frederick Campbell,
Stated Clerk, Presbytery of Brooklyn."

Dec. 1, 1904.

In the light of this answer, the Board felt that it would not be justified in longer holding back from the white harvest field two laborers who had shown a singularly earnest desire to be set at work in it.

We would add that the disapproval by Synod of the action of the Presbytery of Brooklyn in licensing and ordaining these men was concerned with certain irregularities of form in the action of Presbytery, and had no direct bearing on the fitness of the men; also that the member of the Board who is referred to in the protest as having expressed some dissatisfaction with the examination of these two men before Presbytery had as a member of the Presbytery of Brooklyn voted to ~~sustain their examination and to~~ ordain them and had as a member of the Board expressed his judgment that they should be sent to the field, and that he is himself one of the signers of this reply to the protestants.

Signed-

Jan. 16, 1905

Reply to the Protest of the ~~Rev. Dr. Robert Purcell Booth, the~~ Rev. Dr. John Fox and Mr. Warner Van Norden, dated December 19th, to the Board's action of December 5th in the case of the Revs. Frank E. Field and William H. Gleysteen.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Your Committee, to whom was referred the protest against the sending out of Messrs. Field and Gleysteen recommend the following answer:

With regard to the concluding sentence of this protest, and in justice to our Secretaries, the Board would state that no time was specified as to when the Council should write; that Dr. Brown , to whom the correspondence with these candidates naturally fell, was absent at the Synods on October 17th when the action was taken and that before his return, October 31st, Mr. Speer had to leave to visit the Synods, while Dr. Ellinwood was ill. Because of these absences no Council meeting was practicable till Nov. 3rd, by which time the receipt of another action of the Presbytery of Brooklyn had made it appear desirable to consult the Board again before starting the correspondence, the next meeting of the Board being only four days later. This delay was approved by the President and several members of the Board who happened to call at the office.

At this Board meeting on the 7th of November, the matter was referred back to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, and on motion of Dr. Booth, one of the protestants, the Secretaries were directed to refrain from correspondence with the candidates till further orders.

As to the main points of the protest, the Board heartily agrees with the protestants as to the urgent importance of sending to the field only men sound in the faith as held by our Church. Our differ-

ence with them concerns the best method of securing such soundness. The Board has confidence in the method provided by the Constitution of our Church. It has been our well established policy, definitely formulated on the 6th of May, 1902 under the counsel of the late Dr. Wm. H. Paxton, that the Board should "recognize that the responsibility for considering the doctrinal views of ministerial candidates rests with the presbyteries", the Board accepting such candidates only on condition of their recommendation by the Presbyteries to which they severally belong.

In case of anxiety whether there might not be points of doctrinal unsoundness which had not been brought to the attention of the commending presbytery, the Board has conceived that it would be guilty of no disrespect to that body if it should refer the case to it for further assurance. This was done in the case of Mr. J. E. Russell, on March 20th, 1899, in the following action, taken on the recommendation of a Special Committee consisting of the Rev. Drs. John E. Wells, Howard Duffield and George Alexander-

"The Committee appointed to confer with Mr. J. Elmer Russell, beg leave to report, that inasmuch as no appointment of a clerical missionary is complete till he is ordained, and as the President of the Seminary in which Mr. Russell obtained the major part of his theological education has expressed doubt concerning his perfect accord with the doctrinal system of the Presbyterian Church, it is recommended that the Board, having no authority to pass upon ecclesiastical questions, refer the communication of President Booth to the Presbytery with which Mr. Russell is connected, that it may exercise due diligence in ascertaining his soundness in the faith."

This same course has been carefully pursued in the case now under discussion, as will appear from the following records,

ACTION TAKEN BY THE BOARD, November 7th, 1904.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

"The Board having under consideration the case of Messrs. Gleysteen and Field, and having heard certain statements made by members of the Board in which doubt in regard to the doctrinal soundness of these brethren was expressed, it was resolved that the case be referred to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, with the request that the Pres-

bytery take measures to ascertain the facts and to satisfy the Board in respect to this important question, and that meanwhile the Council be directed to refrain from further action under the Resolution of October 17th."

The reply of the Presbytery of Brooklyn was as follows:

"I respectfully report that , at its stated meeting held on Monday, Nov. 28th, the Presbytery adopted the following resolution,-
"Presbytery commends the zeal of the Foreign Board that only men sound in the faith be sent to the foreign field, and its recognition that the determination of that soundness is the concern of the Presbyteries rather than of the Board itself. It gladly makes reply to the Board's inquiry that during the examination for ordination of the Rev. Mr. Field and the Rev. Mr. Gleysteen special attention was paid to their belief in the important doctrine of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and that they approved themselves to the Presbytery as brethren sound in their faith, and they were accordingly ordained."

Yours truly,
(signed) Frederick Campbell,
Stated Clerk, Presbytery of Brooklyn."

Dec. 1, 1904.

In the light of this answer, the Board felt that it would not be justified in longer holding back from the white harvest field two laborers who had shown a singularly earnest desire to be set at work in it.

We would add that the disapproval by Synod of the action of the Presbytery of Brooklyn in licensing and ordaining these men was concerned with certain irregularities of form in the action of Presbytery, and had no direct bearing on the fitness of the men; also that the member of the Board who is referred to in the protest as having expressed some dissatisfaction with the examination of these two men before Presbytery had as a member of the Presbytery of Brooklyn voted to sustain their examination and to ordain them and had as a member of the Board expressed his judgment that they should be sent to the field, and that he is himself one of the signers of this reply to the protestants.

Signed-

Board Jan. 16, 1905

REPLY to the protest of the ~~Rev. Dr. Robert Russell Booth,~~ the Rev. Dr. John Fox and Mr. Warner Van Norden, dated December 19th, to the Board's action of December 5th. in the case of the Revs. Frank M. Field and William H. Gleysteen.

. . . . . .

Your Committee, to whom was referred the protest against the sending out of Messrs. Field and Gleysteen, recommend the following answer:

With regard to the concluding sentence of this protest, and in justice to our Secretaries, the Board would state that no time was specified as to when the Council should write; that Dr.Brown, to whom the correspondence with these candidates naturally fell, was absent at the Synods on October 17th when the action was taken and that before his return, October 31st. Mr.Speer had to leave to visit the Synods, while Mr. Rand also was absent. Because of these absences, no Council meeting was practicable till Nov.3rd. by which time the receipt of another action of the Presbytery of Brooklyn had made it appear desirable to consult the Board again before starting the correspondence, the next meeting of the Board being only four days later. This delay was approved by the President and several members of the Board who happened to call at the office.

At this Board meeting on the 7th of November, the matter was referred back to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, and the Secretaries were directed to refrain from correspondence with the candidates till further orders.

As to the main points of the protest, the Board heartily agrees with the protestants as to the urgent importance of sending to the field only men sound in the faith as held by our Church. Our difference with them concerns the best method of securing such soundness. The Board has confidence in the method provided by the Constitution of Our Church. It has been our well established policy, definitely for-

mulated on the 6th of May, 1902, under the counsel of the late Dr. Wm. H. Paxton, that the Board should "recognize that the responsibility for considering the doctrinal views of Ministerial candidates rests with the presbyteries", the Board accepting such candidates only on condition of their recommendation by the Presbyteries to which they severally belong.

In case of anxiety whether there might not be points of doctrinal unsoundness, which had not been brought to the attention of the commending presbytery, the Board has conceived that it would be guilty of no disrespect to that body if it should refer the case to it for further assurance. This was done in the case of Mr. J. E. Russell on March 20th, 1899, in the following action, taken on the recommendation of a Special Committee consisting of the Rev. Drs. John D. Wells, Howard Duffield and George Alexander:

"The Committee appointed to confer with Mr. J. Elmer Russell, beg leave to report, that inasmuch as no appointment of a clerical missionary is complete till he is ordained, and as the President of the Seminary in which Mr. Russell obtained the major part of his theological education has expressed doubt concerning his perfect accord with the doctrinal system of the Presbyterian Church, it is recommended that the Board, having no authority to pass upon ecclesiastical questions, refer the communication of President Booth to the Presbytery with which Mr. Russell is connected, that it may exercise due diligence in ascertaining his soundness in the faith".

This same course has been carefully pursued in the case now under discussion, as will appear from the following records,

ACTION TAKEN BY THE BOARD, November 7th, 1904.

)- - - - - - - - - - -(

"The Board having under consideration the case of Messrs. Slayateen and Field, and having heard certain statements made by members of the Board in which doubt in regard to the doctrinal soundness of these brethren was expressed, it was resolved that the case be referred to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, with the request that the presbytery take measures to ascertain the facts and to satisfy the Board in respect to this important question, and that meanwhile the Council be directed to refrain from further action under the Resoltuion of October 17th."

The reply of the Presbytery of Brooklyn was as follows:

"I respectfully report that, at its stated meeting held on Monday, November 28th, the Presbytery adopted the following resolution,

'Presbytery commends the zeal of the Foreign Board that only men sound in the faith be sent to the foreign field, and its recognition that the determination of that soundness is the concern of the Presbyteries rather than of the Board itself. It gladly makes reply to the Board's inquiry that during the examination for ordination of the Rev. Mr. Field and the Rev. Mr. Gleystein, special attention was paid to their belief in the important doctrine of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and that they approved themselves to the Presbytery as brethren sound in their faith, and they were accordingly ordained'.

Yours truly,

(signed) Frederick Campbell,

Stated Clerk, Presbytery of Brooklyn'.

December 1, 1904.

In the light of this answer, the Board felt that it would not be justified in longer holding back from the white harvest field two laborers, who had shown a singularly earnest desire to be set at work in it.

We would add that the disapproval by Synod of the action of the Presbytery of Brooklyn in licensing and ordaining these men was concerned with certain irregularities of form in the action of Presbytery, and had no direct bearing on the fitness of the men; also that the member of the Board who is referred to in the protest as having expressed some dissatisfaction with the examination of these two men before Presbytery, had as a member of the Presbytery of Brooklyn voted to ordain them and had as a member of the Board, expressed his judgment that they should be sent to the field, and that he is himself one of the signers of this reply to the protestants.

(signed) Wm. R. Richards
Darwin R. James.

Jan. 16, 1905

Reply to the Protest of the ~~Rev. Dr. Robert Purcell Booth,~~ the Rev. Dr. John Fox and Mr. Warner Van Norden, dated December 19th, to the Board's action of December 5th in the case of the Revs. Frank E. Field and William H. Gleysteen.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Your Committee, to whom was referred the protest against the sending out of Messrs. Field and Gleysteen recommend the following answer:

With regard to the concluding sentence of this protest, and in justice to our Secretaries, the Board would state that no time was specified as to when the Council should write; that Dr. Brown, to whom the correspondence with these candidates naturally fell, was absent at the Synods on October 17th when the action was taken and that before his return, October 31st, Mr. Speer had to leave to visit the Synods, while Mr. Hand was also absent. ~~Dr. Hildreth was ill.~~ Because of these absences no Council meeting was practicable till Nov. 3rd, by which time the receipt of another action of the Presbytery of Brooklyn had made it appear desirable to consult the Board again before starting the correspondence, the next meeting of the Board being only four days later. This delay was approved by the President and several members of the Board who happened to call at the office.

At this Board meeting on the 7th of November, the matter was referred back to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, and on motion of Dr. Booth, ~~one of the protestants,~~ the Secretaries were directed to refrain from correspondence with the candidates till further orders.

As to the main points of the protest, the Board heartily agrees with the protestants as to the urgent importance of sending to the field only men sound in the faith as held by our Church. Our differ-

ence with them concerns the best method of securing such soundness. The Board has confidence in the method provided by the Constitution of our Church. It has been our well established policy, definitely formulated on the 6th of May, 1902 under the counsel of the late Dr. Wm. M. Paxton, that the Board should "recognize that the responsibility for considering the doctrinal views of ministerial candidates rests with the presbyteries", the Board accepting such candidates only on condition of their recommendation by the Presbyteries to which they severally belong.

In case of anxiety whether there might not be points of doctrinal unsoundness which had not been brought to the attention of the commending presbytery, the Board has conceived that it would be guilty of no disrespect to that body if it should refer the case to it for further assurance. This was done in the case of Mr. J. E. Russell, on March 20th, 1899, in the following action, taken on the recommendation of a Special Committee consisting of the Rev. Drs. John T. Wells, Howard Duffield and George Alexander-

"The Committee appointed to confer with Mr. J. Elmer Russell, beg leave to report, that inasmuch as no appointment of a clerical missionary is complete till he is ordained, and as the President of the Seminary in which Mr. Russell obtained the major part of his theological education has expressed doubt concerning his perfect accord with the doctrinal system of the Presbyterian Church, it is recommended that the Board, having no authority to pass upon ecclesiastical questions, refer the communication of President Booth to the Presbytery with which Mr. Russell is connected, that it may exercise due diligence in ascertaining his soundness in the faith."

This same course has been carefully pursued in the case now under discussion, as will appear from the following record,

ACTION TAKEN BY THE BOARD, November 7th, 1904.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

"The Board having under consideration the case of Messrs. Gleysteen and Field, and having heard certain statements made by members of the Board in which doubt in regard to the doctrinal soundness of these brethren was expressed, it was resolved that the case be referred to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, with the request that the Pres-

bytery take measures to ascertain the facts and to satisfy the Board in respect to this important question, and that meanwhile the Council be directed to refrain from further action under the Resolution of October 17th."

The reply of the Presbytery of Brooklyn was as follows:

"I respectfully report that , at its stated meeting held on Monday, Nov. 28th, the Presbytery adopted the following resolution,-
"Presbytery commends the zeal of the Foreign Board that only men sound in the faith be sent to the foreign field, and its recognition that the determination of that soundness is the concern of the Presbyteries rather than of the Board itself. It gladly makes reply to the Board's inquiry that during the examination for ordination of the Rev. Mr. Field and the Rev. Mr. Gleysteen special attention was paid to their belief in the important doctrine of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and that they approved themselves to the Presbytery as brethren sound in their faith, and they were accordingly ordained."

Yours truly,
(signed) Frederick Campbell,
Stated Clerk, Presbytery of Brooklyn."

Dec. 1, 1904.

In the light of this answer, the Board felt that it would not be justified in longer holding back from the white harvest field two laborers who had shown a singularly earnest desire to be set at work in it.

We would add that the disapproval by Synod of the action of the Presbytery of Brooklyn in licensing and ordaining these men was concerned with certain irregularities of form in the action of Presbytery, and had no direct bearing on the fitness of the men; also that the member of the Board who is referred to in the protest as having expressed some dissatisfaction with the examination of these two men before Presbytery had as a member of the Presbytery of Brooklyn voted to sustain their examination and to ordain them and had as a member of the Board expressed his judgment that they should be sent to the field, and that he is himself one of the signers of this reply to the protestants.

Signed-

Reply to the Protest of the Rev. Dr. Robert Russell Booth, the Rev. Dr. John Fox and Mr. Warner Van Norden, dated December 19th, to the Board's action of December 5th in the case of the Revs. Frank S. Field and William H. Gleysteen.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Your Committee, to whom was referred the protest against the sending out of Messrs. Field and Gleysteen recommend the following answer;

With regard to the concluding sentence of this protest, and in justice to our Secretaries, the Board would state that no time was specified as to when the Council should write; that Dr. Brown , to whom the correspondence with these candidates naturally fell, was absent at the Synods on October 17th when the action was taken and that before his return, October 31st, Mr. Speer had to leave to visit the Synods, while Dr. Ellinwood was ill. Because of these absences no Council meeting was practicable till Nov. 3rd, by which time the receipt of another action of the Presbytery of Brooklyn had made it appear desirable to consult the Board again before starting the correspondence, the next meeting of the Board being only four days later. This delay was approved by the President and several members of the Board who happened to call at the office.

At this Board meeting on the 7th of November, the matter was referred back to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, and on motion of Dr. Booth, one of the protestants, the Secretaries were directed to refrain from correspondence with the candidates till further orders.

As to the main points of the protest, the Board heartily agrees with the protestants as to the urgent importance of sending to the field only men sound in the faith as held by our Church. Our differ-

ence with them concerns the best method of securing such soundness. The Board has confidence in the method provided by the Constitution of our Church. It has been our well established policy, definitely formulated on the 6th of May, 1908 under the counsel of the late Dr. Wm. M. Paxton, that the Board should "recognize that the responsibility for considering the doctrinal views of ministerial candidates rests with the presbyteries", the Board accepting such candidates only on condition of their recommendation by the Presbyteries to which they severally belong.

In case of anxiety whether there might not be points of doctrinal unsoundness which had not been brought to the attention of the commending presbytery, the Board has conceived that it would be guilty of no disrespect to that body if it should refer the case to it for further assurance. This was done in the case of Mr. J. E. Russell, on March 20th, 1899, in the following action, taken on the recommendation of a Special Committee consisting of the Rev. Drs. John E. Wells, Howard Duffield and George Alexander-

"The Committee appointed to confer with Mr. J. Elmer Russell, beg leave to report, that inasmuch as no appointment of a clerical missionary is complete till he is ordained, and as the President of the Seminary in which Mr. Russell obtained the major part of his theological education has expressed doubt concerning his perfect accord with the doctrinal system of the Presbyterian Church, it is recommended that the Board, having no authority to pass upon ecclesiastical questions, refer the communication of President Booth to the Presbytery with which Mr. Russell is connected, that it may exercise due diligence in ascertaining his soundness in the faith."

This same course has been carefully pursued in the case now under discussion, as will appear from the following records,

ACTION TAKEN BY THE BOARD, November 7th, 1904.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

"The Board having under consideration the case of Messrs. Gleysteen and Field, and having heard certain statements made by members of the Board in which doubt in regard to the doctrinal soundness of these brethren was expressed, it was resolved that the case be referred to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, with the request that the Pres-

bytery take measures to ascertain the facts and to satisfy the Board in respect to this important question, and that meanwhile the Council be directed to refrain from further action under the Resolution of October 17th."

The reply of the Presbytery of Brooklyn was as follows:

"I respectfully report that , at its stated meeting held on Monday, Nov. 28th, the Presbytery adopted the following resolution,- "Presbytery commends the zeal of the Foreign Board that only men sound in the faith be sent to the foreign field, and its recognition that the determination of that soundness is the concern of the Presbyteries rather than of the Board itself. It gladly makes reply to the Board's inquiry that during the examination for ordination of the Rev. Mr. Field and the Rev. Mr. Cleyntern special attention was paid to their belief in the important doctrine of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and that they approved themselves to the Presbytery as brethren sound in their faith, and they were accordingly ordained."

Yours truly,
(signed) Frederick Campbell,
Stated Clerk, Presbytery of Brooklyn."

Dec. 1, 1904.

In the light of this answer, the Board felt that it would not be justified in longer holding back from the white harvest field two laborers who had shown a singularly earnest desire to be set at work in it.

We would add that the disapproval by Synod of the action of the Presbytery of Brooklyn in licensing and ordaining these men was concerned with certain irregularities of form in the action of Presbytery, and had no direct bearing on the fitness of the men; also that the member of the Board who is referred to in the protest as having expressed some dissatisfaction with the examination of these two men before Presbytery had as a member of the Presbytery of Brooklyn voted to sustain their examination and to ordain them and had as a member of the Board expressed his judgment that they should be sent to the field, and that he is himself one of the signers of this reply to the protestants.

Signed-

Reply to the Protest of the Rev. Dr. Robert Russell Booth, the Rev. Dr. John Fox and Mr. Warner Van Norden, dated December 19th, to the Board's action of December 5th in the case of the Revs. Frank E. Field and William H. Gleysteen.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Your Committee, to whom was referred the protest against the sending out of Messrs. Field and Gleysteen recommend the following answer:

With regard to the concluding sentence of this protest, and in justice to our Secretaries, the Board would state that no time was specified as to when the Council should write; that Dr. Brown , to whom the correspondence with these candidates naturally fell, was absent at the Synods on October 17th when the action was taken and that before his return, October 31st, Mr. Spear had to leave to visit the Synods, while Dr. Ellinwood was ill. Because of these absences no Council meeting was practicable till Nov. 3rd, by which time the receipt of another action of the Presbytery of Brooklyn had made it appear desirable to consult the Board again before starting the correspondence, the next meeting of the Board being only four days later. This delay was approved by the President and several members of the Board who happened to call at the office.

At this Board meeting on the 7th of November, the matter was referred back to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, and on motion of Dr. Booth, one of the protestants, the Secretaries were directed to refrain from correspondence with the candidates till further orders.

As to the main points of the protest, the Board heartily agrees with the protestants as to the urgent importance of sending to the field only men sound in the faith as held by our Church. Our differ-

ence with them concerns the best method of securing such soundness. The Board has confidence in the method provided by the Constitution of our Church. It has been our well established policy, definitely formulated on the 6th of May, 1908 under the counsel of the late Dr. Wm. L. Paxton, that the Board should "recognize that the responsibility for considering the doctrinal views of ministerial candidates rests with the presbyteries", the Board accepting such candidates only on condition of their recommendation by the Presbyteries to which they severally belong.

In case of anxiety whether there might not be points of doctrinal unsoundness which had not been brought to the attention of the commending presbytery, the Board has conceived that it would be guilty of no disrespect to that body if it should refer the case to it for further assurance. This was done in the case of Mr. J. E. Russell, on March 20th, 1899, in the following action, taken on the recommendation of a Special Committee consisting of the Rev. Drs. John D. Wells, Howard Duffield and George Alexander-

"The Committee appointed to confer with Mr. J. Elmer Russell, beg leave to report, that/inasmuch as no appointment of a clerical missionary is complete till he is ordained, and as the President of the Seminary in which Mr. Russell obtained the major part of his theological education has expressed doubt concerning his perfect accord with the doctrinal system of the Presbyterian Church, it is recommended that the Board, having no authority to pass upon ecclesiastical questions, refer the communication of President Booth to the Presbytery with which Mr. Russell is connected, that it may exercise due diligence in ascertaining his soundness in the faith."

This same course has been carefully pursued in the case now under discussion, as will appear from the following records,

ACTION TAKEN BY THE BOARD, November 7th, 1904.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

"The Board having under consideration the case of Messrs. Gleysteen and Field, and having heard certain statements made by members of the Board in which doubt in regard to the doctrinal soundness of these brethren was expressed, it was resolved that the case be referred to the Presbytery of Brooklyn, with the request that the Pres-

bytery take measures to ascertain the facts and to satisfy the Board in respect to this important question, and that meanwhile the Council be directed to refrain from further action under the Resolution of October 17th."

The reply of the Presbytery of Brooklyn was as follows:

"I respectfully report that , at its stated meeting held on Monday, Nov. 28th, the Presbytery adopted the following resolution,- "Presbytery commends the zeal of the Foreign Board that only men sound in the faith be sent to the foreign field, and its recognition that the determination of that soundness is the concern of the Presbyteries rather than of the Board itself. It gladly makes reply to the Board's inquiry that during the examination for ordination of the Rev. Mr. Field and the Rev. Mr. Gleysteen special attention was paid to their belief in the important doctrine of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and that they approved themselves to the Presbytery as brethren sound in their faith, and they were accordingly ordained."

Yours truly,
(signed) Frederick Campbell,
Stated Clerk, Presbytery of
Brooklyn."

Dec. 1, 1904.

In the light of this answer, the Board felt that it would not be justified in longer holding back from the white harvest field two laborers who had shown a singularly earnest desire to be set at work in it.

We would add that the disapproval by Synod of the action of the Presbytery of Brooklyn in licensing and ordaining these men was concerned with certain irregularities of form in the action of Presbytery, and had no direct bearing on the fitness of the men; also that the member of the Board who is referred to in the protest as having expressed some dissatisfaction with the examination of these two men before Presbytery had as a member of the Presbytery of Brooklyn voted to sustain their examination and to ordain them and had as a member of the Board expressed his judgment that they should be sent to the field, and that he is himself one of the signers of this reply to the protestants.

Signed-

Considered by Africa Com. & Council Oct 3, 1905, but no conclusion reached same that * should be omitted anyway.

~~Sept. 23, 1905.~~

18 Consideration was given to Dr. Halsey's recommendation that certain lay missionaries should be ordained either as elders or evangelists. This appears to be a question of ecclesiastical procedure which is beyond the authority of the Board, but the Committee and the Council are of the opinion that if a man is qualified to represent the Presbyterian Churchas a foreign missionary, it is fair to assume that he is not unfit ~~as~~ to be an elder. We doubt whether ~~It is not clear to us that~~ ordination is required or expedient so far as participation in the government of the native church is concerned, the missionary being as a rule able to exert all needful influence in that direction without actual membership in the judicatory, ~~but it is sometimes expedient for~~ desirable that

* ~~a lay missionary to~~ should be able to serve ~~the elements in the Lord's Supper and, in the absence of a minister, to administer the sacraments himself. In any event,~~ But he is expected to conduct public meetings and to do a considerable amount of preaching. It is moreover frequently desirable that when at home on furlough he should be able to represent his Presbytery in a Synod or the General Assembly. We therefore recommend that in cases where the Executive Council deems ~~such ordination~~ it advisable, the Council be authorized to suggest to the sessions concerned the expediency of ~~such~~ ordination to the eldership, unless in any particular case it shall appear wiser to correspond with the Presbytery as to ordination as an evangelist. This recommendation however does not contemplate the general practice of ordaining all lay missionaries, but only those who are so situated that in the judgment of the Executive Council ordination is specially desirable. (Dr. Halsey's Report, p. 72)

Sept. 29m 1905.

Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D.D.,

New York City,

Dear Dr. Brown:

In reply to yours of Sept. 27th, I have to state that none but regularly ordained ministers can administer the Lord's Supper or baptize converts and infants. The Confession of Faith, Chapter 27, Section 4, declares specifically concerning the two sacraments, "neither of which may be dispensed by any but a minister of the Word lawfully ordained." Ruling elders therefore have no more right than any other member of the church to administer the sacraments. There is only one thing that can be done in this matter, and that is for the Presbyteries of the foreign mission fields themselves to ordain, the brethren whom you have in mind, as ministers.

With best wishes.

(signed) Wm. H. Roberts.

September 26, 1905.

Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D.D.,

156 Fifth Avenue, N.Y.City.

Dear Dr. Brown :

In reply to yours of Sept. 25th, allow me to suggest that a Presbytery can act under Constitutional Rule No. 1, entitled "Local Evangelists," and license as such evangelists the lay missionaries of the Board of Foreign Missions. I enclose you a copy of said Constitutional Rule.

In in some cases, licensure as a local evangelist is not sufficient for the needs of the work in any given foreign field, a Presbytery has the discretionary power under Form of Government, Chapter 15, Section 15, to ordain men to the ministry as evangelists. I think that this power is capable of being employed with large discretion. It has been so employed in certain home mission fields. Where a lay missionary has had a college education I think that a Presbytery would be inclined to interpret this law as to the ordination of evangelists with much liberality.

Yours very truly,

Wm. H. Roberts,

S.C.G.A.

Constitutional Rule, No. 1.

Local Evangelists.

"It shall be lawful for presbytery, after proper examination as to his piety, knowledge of the Scriptures, and ability to teach, to license as a local evangelist, any male member of the Church, who in the judgment of presbytery is qualified to teach the gospel publicly, and who is willing to engage in such service under the direction of presbytery. Such license shall be valid for but one year unless renewed, and such licensed local evangelist shall report to the Presbytery at least once each year, and his license may be withdrawn at any time at the pleasure of presbytery. The person securing such license shall not be ordained to the gospel ministry should he desire to enter it, until he shall have served at least four years as a local evangelist, and shall have pursued and been examined upon what would be equivalent to a three years' course of study in theology, homiletics, Church history, Church polity, and the English Bible under the direction of Presbytery."

A true copy.

(signed) Wm. H. Roberts ,
S.C.G.A.

North Laos Mission Meetings Dec. 1909

Report of the Committee on Enlarging the Powers of the Executive Committee

Amended and adopted.

1. Amend Mission Manual Sec. V Par. 8, by prefixing to the present list of Permanent Committees the word, "Executive"

11. For Sec. V Par. 10 substitute the following:-

"No one shall be eligible to election on the Executive Committee who has not had at least five years' service in the Mission. But in the consideration of all financial matters the Treasurer of the Mission shall beex-officio a consulting member of the Executive Committee."

111. To Sec. V add Paragraph 11, as follows:-

"The powers and duties of the Executive Committee shall be as follows:-

(1) To represent the Mission on questions which effect its relations to diplomatic and native officials and to Missions of other churches. During interim between annual meetings of the Mission its additional duties shall be as in the clauses below.

(2) To act in behalf of the Mission on financial or other matters emanating from the Board or other sources outside of the Mission.

(3) To act on emergency requests, financial or otherwise, to the Board.

(4) To fill vacancies in all Committees and Offices.

(5) To provide for emergencies caused by resignations, deaths, health leaves or regular furloughs by transferring missionaries from one Station to another.

(6) To decide on the "interim" location of new and return-

ing missionaries, and their route of travel from Bangkok, and to advise them accordingly.

(7) To settle appeals from individual missionaries and from Stations.

(8) To keep on file all papers relating to all actions taken by the Committee.

(9) To submit for direct action of the Mission all matters upon which the Committee itself is not unanimous.

(10) To give immediate notice to the Mission, by wire if necessary, of important motions, in order to afford opportunity for protest: and to mail a copy of each action of the Committee to each Station by first opportunity.

(11) To submit to the Mission for immediate review any action of the Committee which has evoked protest from as many as three members of the Mission: provided, however, that if, after receiving the protests, the Committee is still unanimous on any action taken by them, they be allowed to send a copy of their action to the Board without waiting for Mission action, but adding a statement to the Board that after considering the protests the Committee is still unanimous, and that the matter is being reviewed by the Mission.

(12) To submit a report to the Annual Mission Meetings of all actions taken by the Committee: not for approval of the Mission, but merely to review before the Mission the actions taken ad interim."

IV. To Sec. V add also Paragraph 12, as follows:- "Affirmative votes numbering at least two thirds of the voting members of the Mission then upon the field shall be required to sustain any protested action of the Executive Committee, whether

the Mission's vote be taken in regular session or ad interim. All unrecorded votes shall be counted in the affirmative to sustain."

V. Amend Sec. V Paragraph 6, by adding the following clause:- "The presumption under which the Mission, the Executive Committee and this Committee shall proceed is that appointments of missionaries to Stations and assignment to them of work are both permanent until changed for good reasons."

Vl. In answer to the Board's question, "What rights now reserved by the Board do the Missions think might be transferred to the Executive Committee:" we recommend that the Mission request of the Board that the Mission receive notice of proposed action by the Board, and be heard from in answer through the Mission's Executive Committee, before the Board takes final action concerning the abandonment of a Station or anything adverse to our Mission."

(Sgd.) Hugh Taylor

North Laos Mission Secretary

North Laos Mission Meetings Dec. 1909

Report of the Committee on Enlarging the Powers of the Executive Committee

Amended and adopted.

1. Amend Mission Manual Sec. V Par. 8, by prefixing to the present list of Permanent Committees the word, "Executive"

11. For Sec. V Par. 10 substitute the following:-

"No one shall be eligible to election on the Executive Committee who has not had at least five years' service in the Mission. But in the consideration of all financial matters the Treasurer of the Mission shall beex-officio a consulting member of the Executive Committee."

111. To Sec. V add Paragraph 11, as follows:-

"The powers and duties of the Executive Committee shall be as follows:-

(1) To represent the Mission on questions which effect its relations to diplomatic and native officials and to Missions of other churches. During interim between annual meetings of the Mission its additional duties shall be as in the clauses below.

(2) To act in behalf of the Mission on financial or other matters emanating from the Board or other sources outside of the Mission.

(3) To act on emergency requests, financial or otherwise, to the Board.

(4) To fill vacancies in all Committees and Offices.

(5) To provide for emergencies caused by resignations, deaths, health leaves or regular furloughs by transferring missionaries from one Station to another.

(6) To decide on the "interim" location of new and return-

ing missionaries, and their route of travel from Bangkok, and to advise them accordingly.

(7) To settle appeals from individual missionaries and from Stations.

(8) To keep on file all papers relating to all actions taken by the Committee.

(9) To submit for direct action of the Mission all matters upon which the Committee itself is not unanimous.

(10) To give immediate notice to the Mission, by wire if necessary, of important motions, in order to afford opportunity for protest: and to mail a copy of each action of the Committee to each Station by first opportunity.

(11) To submit to the Mission for immediate review any action of the Committee which has evoked protest from as many as three members of the Mission: provided, however, that if, after receiving the protests, the Committee is still unanimous on any action taken by them, they be allowed to send a copy of their action to the Board without waiting for Mission action, but adding a statement to the Board that after considering the protests the Committee is still unanimous, and that the matter is being reviewed by the Mission.

(12) To submit a report to the Annual Mission Meetings of all actions taken by the Committee: not for approval of the Mission, but merely to review before the Mission the actions taken ad interim."

IV. To Sec. V add also Paragraph 12, as follows:- "Affirmative votes numbering at least two thirds of the voting members of the Mission then upon the field shall be required to sustain any protested action of the Executive Committee, whether

the Mission's vote be taken in regular session or ad interim. All unrecorded votes shall be counted in the affirmative to sustain."

V. Amend Sec. V Paragraph 6, by adding the following clause:- "The presumption under which the Mission, the Executive Committee and this Committee shall proceed is that appointments of missionaries to Stations and assignment to them of work are both permanent until changed for good reasons."

VI. In answer to the Board's question, "What rights now reserved by the Board do the Missions think might be transferred to the Executive Committee:" we recommend that the Mission request of the Board that the Mission receive notice of proposed action by the Board, and be heard from in answer through the Mission's Executive Committee, before the Board takes final action concerning the abandonment of a Station or anything adverse to our Mission."

(Sgd.) Hugh Taylor

North Laos Mission Secretary

K

April 11th, 1911.

Mrs. T. G. Sellew,
Upper Montclair, New Jersey.

My dear Mrs. Sellew:

I appreciate the friendliness of your letter. I thoroughly agree with you that no one should be sent to preach the Gospel on the foreign field unless he has a clear and strong faith in the vital principles of that Gospel. As far as I know, no man has been sent out by our Board who lacks that faith, and there is not the slightest probability that any such man will be sent. The point is simply to be borne in mind that in determining whether a particular man has the required faith, the Presbytery is the authoritative body. The Board is not an ecclesiastical body and is not independent; it is simply the agency of the Presbyterian Church for a certain purpose and has only that authority which the Church, through the General Assembly, has committed to it. We have no power to overturn the form of government of the Presbyterian Church or to exercise functions which the General Assembly does not permit us to exercise. We are Presbyterians, not Congregationalists.

No man can be sent unless the Presbytery which has examined him officially certifies to his soundness. If an individual member of a Presbytery questions that soundness, why should we believe him rather than the majority of his brethren?

If you are in the building sometime, I shall be very glad to talk the matter over with you more fully.

Sincerely yours,

B

Sarah Wrooman c/o Mrs. Katharine V. King –
Yelm, Wash. – R. D. Box 135
Oct. 15, 1932 –

OCT 20 1932

S

~~Dear~~ Dr. Speer,

Since writing to you Aug. 16, '32 in acknowledgment of your very kind & satisfactory letter of Aug. 2" (4"), 1932, I have received a letter from a friend to whom I had quoted your closing paragraph which had reference to "modernism" on the foreign field.

For your information, I enclose a copy of extracts from the letter, as an example of what some are thinking. I do not wish to trouble you, but, (even tho' you have doubtless had many such statements made to you direct) this may be food for thought.

In God's good providence, I have now come North, preparatory to starting east to sail, – God willing – from New York, Nov. 19th. I hope to have the pleasure of a few days' visit with Miss Elma Donaldson at Nickleville, Penn. from about the 26" inst., – probably a week or more –

Hoping to have a glimpse of yourself and other friends before sailing, and with all good wishes in Christ,

Sincerely yours,
Sarah Wrooman –

P.S. Altho' the writer did not expect to be quoted, I have permission to send the extracts without name.
S.W.

Sarah Wrooman c/o Mrs. Katharine V. King –
Yelm, Wash. – R. D. 1, Box 135
Oct. 15, 1932 –

OCT 20 1932

S

Dear Dr. Speer,

Since writing to you Aug. 16, '32 in acknowledgment of your very kind & satisfactory letter of Aug. 2" (4"), 1932, I have received a letter from a friend to whom I had quoted your closing paragraph which had reference to "modernism" on the foreign field.

For your information, I enclose a copy of extracts from the letter, as an example of what some are thinking. I do not wish to trouble you, but, (even tho' you have doubtless had many such statements made to you direct) this may be food for thought.

In God's good providence, I have now come North, preparatory to starting east to sail, – God willing – from New York, Nov. 19th. I hope to have the pleasure of a few days' visit with Miss Elma Donaldson at Nickleville, Penn. from about the 26" inst., – probably a week or more –

Hoping to have a glimpse of yourself and other friends before sailing, and with all good wishes in Christ,

Sincerely yours,
Sarah Wrooman –

P.S. Altho' the writer did not expect to be quoted, I have permission to send the extracts without name.
S.W.

Extracts from the letter of a correspondent with regard to Modernism on the Mission Field — Aug. 22, '32 —

"Re Dr. Speer's views of Modernism on the field, evidently the Board officials have less opportunity to know about such defection than do the missionaries and laymen interested in the soundness of the message. I well remember the reports brought back by both Dr. Speer and Dr. Brown when sent over to investigate the rumors and to encourage the work. Dr. Speer, I am sure, and I have no doubt Dr. Brown too are themselves sound, but this being their reputation among missionaries, when then visit the field, the modernists present an almost solid front as supporting every fundamental of the faith & are not slow to point to apparent results of their "faithfulness" such as number of students, preparedness of graduates and, above all, the free use of orthodox terms to cover up ideas entirely foreign to their true meaning. Moreover, when occasionally a candidate has answered his ordination questions by evasive or unsatisfactory terms & I refer not to Presby. candidates for ordination to the ministry & which have brought out opposition to his acceptance as a missionary, the New York Board of Missions point to the fact that they being mere agents of the Presbyteries to send forth those recommended by the Presbyteries, have no choice in the matter but to appoint them. I recall the ~~the~~ opposition on the part of many intelligent & true supporters of the foreign work to at least two applicants was publicly given in the relig. press of the country & partially reproduced in the secular press. One of these was the son of an earnest, able pair of our early missionaries, himself a brilliant, talented, genial man, one who did make his mark anywhere in the scholastic world & whose superior qualifications gave him wide influence on the field & at home. He was made Pres. of a leading Presby. College in an important part of China. He built up a fine organization. We have been personally well acquainted with two of the faculty & more or less acquainted with others. It is run on modernistic doctrines & methods. Christ's vicarious death in our stead & His bodily resurrection are not among the doctrines taught there & these members of the faculty have no hesitation in pronouncing these doctrines unbelievable when talking with those whom they esteem intelligent but are silent or evasive on these subjects with orthodox friends. A number of other missionaries in that station hold the same unsound views. Yet when Dr. Speer was there he did not suspect their soundness. They showed fine results as far as he could see. The sound missionaries did not feel called upon to complain of their fellows when not questioned about them. Not long afterwards the old missionaries were retired (who had stood for the faith once delivered to the saints) leaving the

field largely to the modernist teachers. Similar conditions prevail in other fields & countries. Here at home many of our large Presbyteries, including New York, Chicago & San Francisco are preëminently modern in their officials. The personnel of the committees or boards of ministerial supply & presbyterial field secretaries make it impossible in many cases for churches in any way receiving financial help from Church agencies to secure a sound minister because of this interference. It is rapidly becoming true of the Presbyterian as of the Methodist Church that an orthodox minister cannot secure a position through the Church agencies. Of course a Church free from obligations to such agencies can select its own minister, if its elders are sufficiently discerning to know the true from the false. But with the decline of the doctrinal teaching in the churches, & it certainly is not popular, — & in the case of young office-holders, too often disregarded. It is now not an uncommon thing for a young outgoing missionaries to the more advanced fields to join with the worldly in dancing and at the card table on the voyage. To a serious question as to why they chose the missionary calling, they have given such replies as "to see the world" &c. The most reliable missionaries of China not long ago estimated that orthodoxy and modernism on the field were about 50 – 50. I should say that I think that was the estimate in Central China. But I am glad to say that we know personally a large number of missionaries who are true unto death in Cent. China, Kansu, Yunnan, Thibetan border, Korea Japan, Manchuria, Africa, India, Philippines, Syria, Poland, as well as home missionaries and have great confidence in a host whom we know only by name and character. But we cannot afford to ~~at present~~ shut our eyes to facts ~~nor to be slow~~ —H— I did not intend a letter on this theme but could not give my view-point in less.